CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.534
13 February 1990

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOURTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 13 February 1990, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Hendrik Wagenmakers (Netherlands)

GE.90-60149/1566B

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 534th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament. The President apologizes for being late, but he was involved in ongoing consultations.

In conformity with its programme of work, the Conference will continue to listen to plenary statements, as well as to deal with a number of organizational questions. In accordance with rule 30 of its rules of procedure, however, any member wishing to do so may raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference.

At the end of the list of speakers, I shall suspend the plenary meeting and convene an informal meeting of the Conference for the consideration of requests for participation from States not members of the Conference. We will later resume this plenary meeting to continue our consideration of that subject.

I have on my list of speakers for today the representative of France, Ambassador Morel, who will speak in his capacity as Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, to introduce the report of that Committee, as well as the representative of Romania. I now give the floor to the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, Ambassador Morel of France, who will introduce the report of the Ad hoc Committee, which has been circulated today as document CD/961.

Mr. MOREL (France) (translated from French): Before introducing the report of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons on the results of its work during the inter-sessional period, allow me, Mr. President, to congratulate you on behalf of my country on your taking up the post of President of the Conference on Disarmament for the month of February. The extensive consultations you have already conducted to ensure a smooth start to our work, and the reaffirmation here in this room at the opening of the session by your Foreign Minister Mr. van den Broek of the commitment of the Netherlands to disarmament, show that we are not resuming our work in a spirit of routine, and on behalf of my country I should like to thank you for it. At the same time I thank Ambassador El Ghali Benhima of Morocco for so effectively presiding over the Conference during a very active month of August.

I should also like to mark the arrival of several colleagues in our midst: Ambassador Andrea Negrotto Cambiaso of Italy, Ambassador Hou Zhitong of China, Ambassador Mitsuro Donowaki of Japan, Ambassador Roberto García Moritán of Argentina, Ambassador José Pérez Novoa of Cuba, Ambassador Stephen Ledogar of the United States of America, Ambassador Gerald Shannon of Canada, Ambassador Horacio Arteaga of Venezuela and Ambassador Miguel Marín Bosch of Mexico. I should like to welcome them to this forum and assure them that my delegation will co-operate with them very actively. Changes entail goodbyes and very friendly wishes to their predecessors who have recently left Geneva: Ambassador Taylhardat, Ambassador Marchand, Ambassador Friedersdorf and Ambassador García Robles. How can we fail to reiterate on this occasion what we owe to Don Alfonso, who has contributed so much to shaping the personality of the Conference on Disarmament and who, for over 10 years, has shown us here in Geneva how disarmament could be both a passionate commitment and a dimension of

(Mr. Morel, France)

contemporary humanism? Lastly, allow me to share with the secretariat of the Conference on Disarmament, on behalf of the French delegation and on my own behalf, the profound sadness we felt on learning of the brutal death of Miss Annie Rebuzzi, whose effective and radiant presence on the sixth floor of the Palais contributed - without our always being fully aware of the fact - to the smooth running of our work.

As agreed at the last meeting of the summer part of the Conference's session, the Ad hoc Committee held open-ended consultations from 28 November to 14 December 1989, followed by a session of limited duration during the period from 11 January to 1 February 1990. This work led to a new version of the "rolling text" (CD/961), which I have the honour to introduce today. Before putting forward a few ideas at the end of a year as Chairman, I should like to comment point by point on the results of this inter-sessional period, which has been very useful in that, in keeping with established practice, it has enabled us largely to put the finishing touches to work already begun during the session itself. Six documents which are new or have been redrafted since the previous report have thus been drawn up.

First of all, the Protocol on inspection procedures. The agreement on a new text - which from now on, in the new version of the "rolling text", replaces the former "Guidelines on the international inspectorate" - rounds off several years of intensive work under the competent guidance of successive group chairmen, and this year particularly the Chairman of Group 1, Mr. Rüdiger Lüdeking, with very active support from many delegations. This commitment was legitimate given what was at stake, namely the development of one of the fundamental tools of the draft convention - verification. I think I can say without exaggeration that, imperfect and incomplete though it may be, this new text represents one of the important achievements of the 1989 session. We now have an outline of a code regulating the practical arrangements for inspections, the precise conduct of inspectors in terms of their rights and duties, and the obligations of States. The structure adopted enables us to draw a precise distinction between general provisions in the area of inspection procedures and specific aspects within the context of various types of inspection. Where the former are concerned, the new text contributes invaluable elements in the area of definitions and, more generally, a more structured presentation in terms of the successive stages of the inspection. As regards routine inspections, important clarifications have been added on the use of continuous monitoring systems.

The work on challenge inspections has enabled us to develop the concept of managed access, particularly in respect of the requirements of confidentiality, and to outline the role of the observer of the requesting State. Finally, a few basic elements, which should be of use for further study of the question, have been incorporated into the procedures governing cases of the alleged use of chemical weapons.

Secondly, the final clauses have been completed, with article XIV, on duration and withdrawal, article XVIII, on the deposit of instruments of ratification and accession, and article XX, on languages and authentic texts, which thus round off the overall structure of the convention as it appears in appendix I of the report. In this way, thanks to the Chairman of Group 2,

(Mr. Morel, France)

Mr. Mohammed Gomaa, the Committee has brought to a successful conclusion the complex work that had begun on the basis of the results of consultations conducted during the 1988 session by the Chairman of the Committee, Ambassador Sujka - results which existed in various versions and which did not commit delegations. It now remains for us to resume work on those matters that still appear in appendix II, namely, article XII, on international agreements, whose presentation has been improved, article XIII, on amendments, which was drawn up during the session, and various questions which have so far not been drawn up in the form of articles, namely, the settlement of disputes, reservations, the status of annexes and, above all, sanctions.

Thirdly, regarding the scientific advisory board, intensive work on the part of the Chairman of Group 3, Mr. Rakesh Sood, has enabled us, while remaining mindful of the legitimate concerns of various delegations, to define in article VIII the general architecture of this forum, which had already been outlined during the session. It seems to me - and the course of the negotiations can only confirm this - that we all acknowledge the need to draw in an appropriate way on the competence of representatives of the international scientific community, in order to adapt the future convention in the light of the development of science and technology, which are changing at an ever greater rate. But we are also concerned to avoid the risks of interference between this new subsidiary body and the operation of the tripartite institutional order established under the convention. This dictated a cautious approach, which led to the balanced arrangement described in the draft convention: an advisory role for the scientific board, which does not detract from its importance; linkage between the board and the Conference of States Parties, on the clear understanding that it will act in close symbiosis with the Director-General. The clarification of these basic concepts, which has now been achieved, should enable us in future to make progress on the work which remains to be done in due course, on the board's mandate, its organization and its operation in practice.

Fourthly, thanks to a generous spirit of conciliation on the part of delegations, the Chairman of Group 4, Mr. Johan Molander, was able, in the first place, to complete successfully a substantial revision of annex 1 to article VI, which in its new version, practically free of square brackets, reflects the agreement among all delegations on the specific conditions governing the limited production of prohibited chemicals on this schedule. The régime applicable to schedule 1 chemicals has thus been very markedly clarified. This refinement has, first of all, enabled us to define the framework for authorized manufacture properly, with the possibility of synthesis for protection purposes in a laboratory other than a small-scale facility. It was also accepted that it was not desirable to seek to control laboratories synthesizing less than 100 grams of such chemicals per year, which considerably facilitates verification and enables us to preserve the confidentiality needed by laboratories engaged in research for medical or pharmaceutical purposes.

Group 4 was also able to devote its last few meetings in January to arrangements for revising the schedules of chemicals and guidelines for the schedules. Its point of departure was suggestions presented during the summer part of the session and an initial paper on general problems proposed in

(Mr. Morel, France)

December. The debate was particularly interesting as it bore on an essential and so far barely studied point - the smooth running of the technical apparatus of the convention after its entry into force. The debates dealt essentially with decision-making arrangements, and led to a new text inserted in the annex on chemicals.

For the schedules this document suggests an evaluation of the Executive Council's proposal for a revision, along with a recommendation to States Parties; their agreement could be secured either tacitly or after formal acceptance by a yet-to-be-defined majority of States. In the absence of such approval, the proposal could be submitted to the Conference of States Parties, either at a regular or at a special session. As far as the guidelines are concerned, the machinery adopted, which is more restrictive, provides for an initial assessment by the Executive Council, followed by a recommendation to States Parties; the decision should in any event be taken by the Conference of States Parties.

Fifthly, in reviewing the work of the groups during the inter-sessional period, I must now recall that it was agreed last August to deal in Group 5 with the very important question of security during the destruction period. Consultations begun by the Group's Chairman, Dr. Walter Krutzsch, when the inter-sessional meetings resumed indicated that in the absence of the paper which was expected from the two countries which have declared that they possess chemical weapons, the conditions for useful work on the subject had not yet been met. But I should also note that developments in the past few months, and particularly the past few days, have confirmed that this necessary preliminary of bilateral work, which is eagerly awaited by the Committee, is well under way. It will then be for the Committee to resume this year, on a new basis, the in-depth consideration of this question, which is of interest to all delegations. I also wish to note that, towards the end of the inter-sessional period, some brackets and major footnotes to articles IV (Chemical weapons) and V (Chemical weapons production facilities) were deleted, which will facilitate the resumption of the Committee's work on this subject.

Sixthly, on challenge inspection, work continued up to the last few days of the inter-sessional period to finalize, in what was deemed the most appropriate manner, the document which had been under preparation throughout the year on this question, in order to define the essential elements which should appear in the second part of article IX of the draft convention. Regarding paragraph 5 of this text, it was considered a little early to clarify the concepts of alternative measures and managed access. On paragraph 6, in contrast, the discussion taken up again on the basis of language outlined in December enabled us, following very interesting and friuitful exchanges of view, to define two aspects of the final phase of consideration of the report after the completion of the inspection proper - namely, the provision of information to the parties and the Executive Council, and the role that can devolve upon the latter. It was not, however, possible to settle everything at a stroke, and at the end of our work, if I may put it like that, I had occasion to stress that we had not yet taken a decision on the decision-making process. But I feel that the new sequence outlined in paragraph 6, like the text as a whole, offers a sound framework for subsequent

(Mr. Morel, France)

reflection, and may be the beginning of a compromise between the various points of view as to the role that should devolve upon the requesting State, the requested State and the organs of the convention.

As for its placement, it was finally agreed that appendix II should continue to be the home of this text, which stems from consultations with all delegations, and which now replaces the former text that was drawn up in 1987 by the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee, Ambassador Ekéus, and added to in 1988 - a text which on his sole responsibility represented a first representation of the various points of view. An introductory section preceding the new document, as well as the various footnotes, clearly show that this is a step forward to be followed up in the context of ongoing work, namely, the elaboration of article IX, part 2. Bearing in mind the importance of this procedure, which all delegations consider to be the corner-stone of the system of verification under the future convention, I venture to stress that this is an urgent task.

Seventh and last, I would like to mention that during the inter-sessional period the Committee benefited from the very intensive work of the Technical Group on Instrumentation created last June and chaired by Dr. Marjatta Rautio. As this work is not a direct part of the negotiations, it was deemed preferable not to insert the Group's final report, which was distributed on 22 January as document CD/CW/WP.272. However, its principal elements are mentioned in paragraph 7 of the introductory part of the "rolling text", and I should like to take this opportunity to stress that this first methodical inventory of the technical and scientific facilities and procedures necessary for the proper implementation of the convention has been very enlightening for all delegations. This report offers a first overall picture and outlines avenues of research for the experts. The work of the Group also made it possible to identify various technical adjustments necessary to arrive at more coherent procedures. More generally, it enabled us to measure to what extent the Committee increasingly required the support of experts to prepare, as of now, for the smooth practical implementation of the future convention.

Allow me to conclude this year as Chairman of the Committee by presenting a few more personal comments. Let me say first of all that it was a fascinating experience, conducted in the course of a year which in many ways was exceptional, in many areas, of course, but also where chemical weapons are concerned, with a remarkable series of decisive initiatives which I need not recall here. Though less spectacular, the speeding up of negotiations within the Conference on Disarmament has been an integral part of this unprecedented sequence, which highlighted the growing importance accorded by the international community to disarmament in the field of chemical weapons. We may regret that in the course of the session it was not possible to complete the task assigned to us, but we must properly weigh up what finalization means. The disappointed expectations of a decisive breakthrough which would resolve the "outstanding problems" at a stroke does not entirely correspond to what remains to be done. At the risk of stretching this strategic metaphor, I will observe that the entire front has moved and that we will succeed in concluding the convention by dealing with it as an integrated and coherent whole.

(Mr. Morel, France)

Specifically I believe that after a year of intensive work on all aspects of the convention we can and must begin to regard the convention as a whole which has already begun to settle into coherence and balance. By the same token, that which remains to be done can in a way be identified in terms of the edifice already built. By proceeding thus by deduction we will be better able to single out the most important areas on which real decisions have to be taken.

Does this mean that the completion of the negotiations now depends only on a few political decisions? I am not convinced of that. At the risk of repeating myself, the experience of the session now coming to an end leads me to observe that politics and technical matters cannot be completely dissociated. Certainly we should avoid getting bogged down in perfectionism or secondary considerations, but we should also beware of believing that we can find a sort of "leg-up" to overcome real difficulties. Yet the approach we have developed little by little together in the course of this year offers two interesting and complementary directions for the last phase of our work. It is a fact that the major questions can be truly settled only if we embark on in-depth work, where the precision of what is known as technical work necessarily has a place. But it is equally true that a number of other technical issues related to the smooth application of the convention can, with the agreement of all delegations, be detached from the negotiations proper and settled in parallel, without being deferred until later.

In the course of this session, we have also better appreciated to what extent the convention had to be universal and hence benefit from accession by all States, to begin with by enabling all States wishing to contribute to negotiations to do so. This broadening of the negotiating work has been the result of more active involvement of delegations of member States and at the same time a broader, more resolute contribution on the part of delegations of non-member States. New work habits have appeared, but we can surely move even further in this direction.

This is also the moment to mention the role of those I would call the "new interlocutors" of delegations, who, without directly participating in the negotiations, contribute essential elements - whether these be - first and foremost, of course - experts from industry, with whom an informal but permanent dialogue has now been established, and whose remarkable commitment in the trial inspections already prefigures the operation of the convention, scientific circles, whose vital contribution is better recognized today, the press, non-governmental organizations, and parliamentarians, who will be both our judges and our counterparts in each national legal system. This brief enumeration of so many partners whose role will constantly grow in this final phase of our work leads me to stress to what extent the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, while pursuing its unstinting daily task, should now size up its collective responsibility in respect of the convention. The more the convention appears as a whole which is in the process of being finalized - and it is more complete than it seems at first glance - the more we must be ready to commit ourselves together to bring it to the stage of full implementation. All delegations agree that about a year will be needed to complete the process - if, of course, the momentum is maintained. Since the calendar is no longer at issue, it remains for us to take the measure of all that this

(Mr. Morel, France)

entails, for us here in Geneva, and for our Governments, and to do so in a very political sense, not to say a moral sense. It is time to say, with Blaise Pascal, "Nous sommes engagés" - we are firmly committed to a difficult task.

It remains for me to thank all the delegations for their stimulating contributions throughout this session, their striking readiness to co-operate, and their encouragement, which has been of great assistance to me. More particularly I should like to thank the delegations in the extended bureau, especially those of the co-ordinators, the United Kingdom, Sweden and Poland, who were my daily partners. My gratitude goes to the five Group Chairmen, Rüdiger Lüdeking, Mohammed Gomaa, Rakesh Sood, Johan Molander and Walter Krutzsch, who have become true companions and friends, as well as Dr. Rautio. I also publicly thank the secretariat of the Ad hoc Committee, Mr. Abdelkader Bensmail, Secretary of the Committee, Ms. Agnès Marcaillou, Mr. Michael Cassandra and Ms. Cheryl Darby, thanks to whom the convention takes shape each day, and I also pay tribute to their exemplary devotion. This is also true of the interpreters, the translators and the conference officers. Lastly, may I be permitted to express my gratitude to the French delegation as a whole - Olivier de la Baume, Pierre Canonne, Michel Pouchepadas, Marie-Thérèse Desbois and Malika Cheniti? All that we have done here in the Palais and the Villa des Ormeaux, we have done together in a true team spirit, without which nothing is possible.

The time has come to extend my warm wishes for success to the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee for this session, Ambassador Hyltenius. These wishes may be expressed in a few words which speak for themselves: continuity, experience, competence, rigour, ambition. The fate of our convention is in good hands.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons for introducing the report of the Ad hoc Committee, as well as for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I wish to express to Ambassador Morel our deep appreciation for the outstanding manner in which he has discharged his responsibilities as Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee, "une expérience passionnante" in his own words. His diplomatic skill, experience and dedication have considerably advanced the work of that subsidiary body, and I wish also to extend our congratulations to him for the progress achieved since he was appointed Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee.

As you know, the Conference has to adopt this report, and I should like to suggest that we proceed to do so at our plenary meeting on Tuesday, 20 February, in accordance with the practice followed by the Conference when dealing with reports of subsidiary bodies.

I now give the floor to the representative of Romania, Mr. Chirila.

Mr. CHIRILA (Romania) (translated from French): First of all, Mr. President, allow me to say how much the Romanian delegation welcomes the fact that you are presiding over the Conference on Disarmament in this important month for the beginning of the work of this year's session. Our satisfaction is the greater because you represent the Netherlands, a State

(Mr. Chirila, Romania)

with which Romania has long-standing relations, and we hope now to strengthen and broaden these relations further. We are convinced that you will guide our efforts with wisdom and competence. We would also like to congratulate Ambassador Benhima of Morocco for the skill and determination with which he led the work of the Conference during August 1989 and the inter-sessional period. We warmly welcome the distinguished representatives who have recently taken up the posts of head of delegation of their countries: Ambassador Negrotto Cambiaso of Italy, Ambassador Pérez Novoa of Cuba, Ambassador Hou Zhitong of China, Ambassador Donowaki of Japan, Ambassador Shannon of Canada, Ambassador García Moritán of Argentina, Ambassador Arteaga of Venezuela, Ambassador Ledogar of the United States and Ambassador Marín Bosch of Mexico. We would like to welcome them and assure them of our full co-operation. Allow me to join my delegation's voice to those who have already expressed condolences on the death of Miss Annie Rebuzzi, a member of the Conference secretariat.

The Conference on Disarmament is beginning its work this year in a context in which the opportunities and prospects are particularly favourable. One element which seems increasingly to rally both the hopes and the efforts of the international community is based mainly on the view that the general political climate favours the reduction of military confrontation and the strengthening of peace and stability.

In his message to the Conference the Secretary-General of the United Nations, echoing the views of many political leaders, mentioned among the factors converging in this direction facts and trends such as the East-West rapprochement, the evolution towards settlement of conflicts in various parts of the world, the important political changes in Europe and in other regions of the world, and the involvement of the United Nations in the major problems that face the international community today.

Analysts say that 1989 was perhaps the most important year in contemporary history. As for my country, we say that 1989 has been a sacramental year for Romania. Obviously this is without ignoring or minimizing in any way the changes in general in Europe and in the world. As you are aware, following the victory of the revolution and the elimination of the dictatorship on 22 December 1989, Romania has set out on a totally new path. From the outset the guiding principle of any programme of action of the Romanian Government was laid down to be the promotion of a domestic and foreign policy in line with the needs and interests of human beings, and full respect for human rights and for Romania's international commitments. Obviously things will not necessarily be easy for us, but the evolution towards authentic democracy in all its dimensions, the natural opening up towards Europe and the world, are irreversible. It goes without saying that a commitment or an effective contribution to the efforts to implement the agreements, as well as the implementation of measures in the field of disarmament, are an integral part of this orientation, this policy on the part of Romania. Always irreversible, ever more effective, we wish to see the large spectrum of negotiations of a universal, regional and bilateral nature as a process that will make disarmament an ever more rapid and perceptible phenomenon in terms of agreements and concrete measures.

(Mr. Chirila, Romania)

In the light of the dynamic progress in international life, the Geneva Conference, the sole framework for comprehensive negotiations for disarmament, must make a more significant contribution, both through negotiation of agreements and measures and through the encouragement of all the discussions and negotiations at all levels and in all areas of disarmament. One of the areas in which the Conference on Disarmament is called upon and in a position to make an immediate and decisive contribution is the negotiation of a convention on the prohibition of the use, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction. Our position concerning chemical disarmament, which is fully marked by openness, a positive approach and determination, is in fact based on two equally important elements: first, my country's position of principle in favour of the banning and elimination of all weapons of mass destruction as soon as possible; second, the fact that Romania possesses no chemical weapons.

We would like to stress here, with all the vigour and determination deriving from the mandate entrusted to our delegation, that Romania has no intention of producing or acquiring chemical weapons in the future. We have firm and clear instructions to act with determination to ensure that the ongoing negotiations are intensified and lead as soon as possible to the conclusion of a universal convention to ban chemical weapons, on the basis of the "rolling text" of the draft. To that end we intend to participate actively in and contribute to the best of our ability to the finalization of the draft articles that are still under discussion. We are of course aware of the problems and difficulties, notable among them that of monitoring, guaranteeing the full implementation of the future regulations. We are in favour of a system of strict and effective monitoring, including facilities for manufacturing chemicals which could present a risk of any kind for the convention. At the same time, we share the practically universal concern to ensure that the future convention does not affect the development of the chemical industry or legitimate international co-operation for peaceful purposes. At the same time we welcome and are ready to support any initiative, gesture or act that will bring us closer as soon as possible to the objective that is imperative by virtue of the weight of the evidence, considerations of effectiveness and from all points of view, namely, the conclusion of a convention universally banning and totally eliminating chemical weapons for ever. In this context, we have learned of the official confirmation that the Soviet Union and the United States plan at the Soviet-American summit next June to conclude a bilateral agreement on the destruction of a part of their CW stockpiles until equal lower levels are reached. We hope that, far from shifting the centre of interest, the Soviet-American bilateral agreement, like any other action in the same field, will encourage and contribute to our negotiations here in Geneva in the multilateral context.

Ambassador Pierre Morel of France, who so assiduously and skilfully guided the work of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons during the preceding session, has just given us an overall picture of the efforts made and the results obtained. However, we cannot hide a certain feeling that, particularly where decisive - political - questions are concerned, the results could have been more significant, especially in view of the more favourable general conditions in recent times. The declaration introduced on behalf

(Mr. Chirila, Romania)

of the Group of 21 at the first plenary meeting of the session by Ambassador Marín Bosch of Mexico should of course be placed in this context. Our delegation is ready to support the proposals made by the Group of 21 in the 6 February declaration. At the same time, we have also seen the significance of reference made by Ambassador Morel in his personal remarks and in his statement to the risk of the illusion of a "leg-up". We will offer our full co-operation to this year's Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, Ambassador Hyltenius of Sweden, and we will do our best to make our modest contribution to collective action on the important and urgent problem of the conclusion of a universal convention on prohibition. We feel that in order to achieve these objectives we have to act with determination and without any prejudice or pre-conditions. In general we consider that, in the field of disarmament, the only approach is to act with perseverance and realism and to move forward gradually towards the achievement of agreements and measures without conditions or artificial linkages.

The negotiation and conclusion of a universal treaty for the cessation and complete prohibition of nuclear tests remains a priority objective on the international disarmament agenda and the agenda of our Conference. Even if it was not possible to set up an ad hoc committee to consider this subject last session, we hope that such a forum for work and negotiations can be set up this year. We welcome and support any efforts to that end, and we have taken note of the willingness of Ambassador Donowaki of Japan to continue the efforts of his predecessor, Ambassador Yamada, on this subject. At the same time we consider that any action to achieve this objective by stages should also be welcomed and placed in the general context of the need to achieve a comprehensive and final solution. We fully appreciate the work of the Group of Seismic Experts to define and install a model international data exchange system for the detection of seismic events, for use in identifying nuclear tests. We will not fail to do our best to support this activity, inter alia through direct involvement and participation.

The Geneva Conference must also continue to concern itself and to seek the most promising ways to consider and negotiate questions designed to halt the nuclear arms race and achieve disarmament in this field. We cannot but fully share the view that so-called "nuclear deterrence" is in fact likely to perpetuate the nuclear arms race. We are for, and we support, agreements to reduce nuclear weapons until they are totally eliminated. Such agreements should be negotiated both between the nuclear-weapon States and, in a broader context, with participation by all, on problems of concern to all. In the first category falls the conclusion of an agreement on 50 per cent reductions in the strategic weapons held by the United States and the Soviet Union, and the beginning of negotiations to eliminate tactical nuclear missiles in Europe. Also in the nuclear context, our Conference should not lose sight of, and should find ways to achieve effective progress in, efforts to provide security guarantees to the non-nuclear-weapon States so that they are not attacked by or threatened with nuclear weapons. We welcome the almost immediate re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee to consider this problem. In carrying out its work the Conference on Disarmament should also bear constantly in mind the prospects and questions which arise from the fact that this very year Geneva will once again host the conference entrusted with the task of reviewing the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, as

(Mr. Chirila, Romania)

well as the fact that the international agenda also includes the convening of a conference to consider the proposal to amend the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty by extending it to cover underground zones.

The prevention of an arms race in outer space, as the recent General Assembly resolutions prove, remains one of the major concerns of the international community. We support all measures negotiated and agreed bilaterally or multilaterally, even if they are incomplete, which can prevent the introduction of weapons and weapons systems in outer space. We favour respect for and the broadening of all existing rules in this field. Our delegation is ready to give its support to proposals concerning, inter alia, the banning of anti-satellite weapons, the elaboration of a code of conduct in outer space or the monitoring of objects launched into space. In our view the mandate and activities of the Ad hoc Committee on outer space at this year's session should reflect and mark a more targeted orientation towards an approach which is both realistic and specific.

Our Conference will be unable to do its best in discharging its mandate unless due attention is given to preventing the development and introduction of new types of weapons of mass destruction. We consider, indeed, that it is high time to study, with all requisite concern and seriousness, the question of an international draft convention on this subject. Our delegation is of course ready to give its full support to efforts to ban radiological weapons, including the banning of attacks against peaceful nuclear installations.

Lastly, allow me to make a few brief references to the organization of the work of the Conference. Our delegation has a clear mandate to act, together with the other members of the Conference, for a gradual move to concrete negotiations concerning all the questions entrusted to it by the General Assembly, as well as the setting up of appropriate working structures to that end. Greater stress on concrete and realistic aspects, on working contacts, consultations and negotiations concerning specific subjects is necessary. If the Conference is to discharge its mission it must reflect as far as possible the international community as a whole. In this context, we are in favour of any initiative to enlarge the Conference and, in general, to meet the desires and the readiness of the largest possible number of States to participate, to be actively involved in the work of the Conference, its working bodies and negotiating bodies. We hope that this year's session of the Conference on Disarmament and its work will be commensurate with the positive changes and developments in international life as a whole that have been generally welcomed.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Romania for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to me. That exhausts my list of speakers. I recognize the representative of the United States of America.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): Although I have not spoken before in this forum, and although I intend to make a more formal initial statement to the Conference in the very near future, I would like to take the floor now to make a couple of brief remarks.

First, I wish to inform members of the Conference on Disarmament that the United States delegation is pleased to have with us today United States

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

Congressman Martin Lancaster and members of his staff. Mr. Lancaster is visiting the United States delegation in his capacity as one of four members of the United States House of Representatives who have been appointed by the Speaker of the House, Mr. Foley as special arms control observers for the chemical weapons negotiations. Congressman Lancaster is making his second trip to Geneva in this capacity, and we welcome his presence among us today as clear evidence that United States interest in a CW convention extends well beyond the executive branch. The United States Congress follows our work here with keen interest. We look forward to working closely with Mr. Lancaster and his colleagues on Capitol Hill.

Secondly, I would like to draw the attention of the members of the Conference to the joint statement on chemical weapons which was issued in Moscow on 10 February, three days ago, by Secretary of State Baker and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. Together with my Soviet colleague, Minister Batsanov, I participated in the Ministerial Meeting and in the preparation of this important bilateral statement. In the United States view, this statement reaffirms President Bush's strong commitment to progress in the multilateral negotiations for a CW convention and our expectation that those bilateral efforts will enhance our multilateral work. You will see that the statement, first of all, reiterates our joint commitment to conclude and bring into force a CW convention as soon as possible. Secondly, it announces our intention, simultaneous with the negotiations on a global ban, to pursue reciprocal obligations: inter alia a programme of co-operation with respect to the destruction of chemical weapons, including co-ordinating the destruction of substantial quantities of CW stocks down to equal low levels on each side. Third, as part of this agreement, we will co-operate on safe destruction technology and carry out further verification experiments. Fourth, we commit ourselves further to reduce our CW stocks down to a very small fraction of present holdings during the first eight years after a CW convention enters into force, and to complete elimination during the subsequent two years, if possible. Fifth, we agree to halt all CW production when a CW convention enters into force. And, finally, the two sides will work to develop common principles that underlie our efforts to prevent the proliferation of chemical weapons.

President Bush believes that as the countries with the largest CW stocks, the United States and the Soviet Union should take the lead in destruction. This will give impetus to the negotiations, in our view, by demonstrating how serious the United States and the Soviet Union are about getting rid of these weapons. Our proposal to destroy all but a very small portion of CW stocks in the first eight years of a convention, we believe, puts this convention on a faster track than the ideas some of our countries talked about before, which would have delayed entry into force until all essential States adhere. What we are saying now is - let us get the convention into force right away with the United States and the Soviet Union on board so that the benefits can be realized right away, and we can work hard to get the other necessary States on board. If we succeed over the first 8 years we can all go to zero in 10 years; if not, it is the United States interpretation that we will have to keep at it. At least we will have the convention with its reductions, production ban, export controls, secretariat, etc.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

In addition to passing out this statement to you today, my Soviet colleague and I will shortly be circulating this paper as a formal CD document through the auspices of the secretariat.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United States of America, Ambassador Ledogar, for his statement. I am happy to note and welcome the presence of Congressman Lancaster at this meeting. I am sure that we will benefit from his visit to this body, and that it will assist us in our negotiations. Does any other member wish to take the floor? It seems not.

I shall now suspend the plenary meeting and, as announced today, convene an informal meeting of the Conference in a few minutes' time to consider requests from non-members to participate in the work of the Conference.

The meeting was suspended at 11.10 a.m. and resumed at 11.30 a.m.

The PRESIDENT: The 534th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament is resumed.

As a result of the informal meeting that we have just held, I propose that we take a decision, as indicated in the note by the President which the secretariat has circulated today as document CD/WP.379, concerning 30 requests from non-member States to participate in our work. Since no objections were raised at the informal meeting, I suggest that we now adopt this decision.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: In connection with the decision just taken, I wish to state the following:

As is well known, the Conference on Disarmament is a specialist body. It is the unique global multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. There is a tradition among CD members of concentrating in their discussions very much on the disarmament issues at hand. This has been the general practice as well for the non-members invited to participate. Many non-members have made contributions of outstanding practical value to our disarmament work. I trust - and am confident - that those non-members who we have just invited will make a constructive contribution to the negotiations and, as the case might be, pre-negotiations on the disarmament issues they have chosen. It is understood that, in accordance with the rules of procedure and the practice of the Conference, invitations extended to non-members are for the 1990 session. It goes without saying that any action from which our negotiations would not benefit would be most inappropriate. In fact, the participation of States non-members of the Conference should contribute to the universality of disarmament agreements.

Our negotiations on a convention banning chemical weapons have shown encouraging progress. This is all the more timely since we have witnessed in the recent past how much suffering chemical weapons may cause. May I therefore remind all delegations, those of member States as well as those of States wishing to accede to the status of participating non-members, that all States participating in the Paris Conference on the prohibition of chemical

(The President)

weapons made the following call in its Final Declaration: "In addition, in order to achieve as soon as possible the indispensable universal character of the convention, they call upon all States to become parties thereto as soon as it is concluded." In this context I note that all 30 States non-members that have addressed communications to us have indicated their wish to participate in our negotiations on chemical weapons.

I have no other business for today, but I recognize the following speakers. There are requests for the floor from Canada, the USSR, Australia and the Islamic Republic of Iran. I recognize the distinguished Ambassador of Canada.

Mr. SHANNON (Canada): This is the first occasion also for me to speak at the Conference on Disarmament. Even though my intervention is to be only a very brief one, focusing on the subject we are now addressing, which is the participation of non-member States that have asked to join in our work, nevertheless I would like to begin on a personal note by thanking you, Sir, and all those others present who have so kindly welcomed me as newcomer to your midst. I am very pleased to take my place here and I can assure you that as was the case of my predecessor Canada will continue to play an active, positive and constructive role in the work of the Conference. Certainly that is my own objective. I also wish to congratulate you on the assumption of the presidency of the Conference, and we are fortunate indeed to have as a President a man of such experience in disarmament and possessing such obvious diplomatic skills.

As we all know, a considerable number of non-member States wrote to you or to the Secretary-General, asking to participate in one or more of our activities. We in Canada are very much encouraged by the increasing level of interest in the work of the Conference that other United Nations Member States are showing. We firmly believe that such an enlarged contribution to our work can only be beneficial. It can bring new ideas and insights into the conduct of our negotiations. And it can sensitize more countries to the complexity of the issues with which we are dealing. Canada has always been an active supporter in the overall United Nations context of the concept of universality of participation, at least as much as possible in the particular contexts of the various institutions involved. More specifically, at the Conference on Disarmament, we strongly support the concept that every United Nations Member State that wishes to do so should be able to join in our work. We are therefore extremely pleased that the final step towards reaching a consensus on this matter which you have so energetically and skilfully been pursuing during the past weeks has finally been taken and that we can now welcome some 30 additional States to share in our work.

But Canada also strongly believes that the privilege of participating carries with it an equal obligation to do so in a positive and helpful manner. The Conference is very much a gathering in which individual States and groupings of States may well have legitimate differences about how best to achieve our goals. And it is only right and proper that those differences be clearly stated and supported. But this is not a political forum, such as is the General Assembly of the United Nations. Here our basic objectives of reaching agreement on instruments that can lead to a safer and more peaceful

(Mr. Shannon, Canada)

world are shared among all of us. It is therefore, in our view, not at all appropriate for States to indulge in polemics and especially to attack one another in this forum. Canada has very much regretted such instances in the past and we very much hope that nothing of that sort will occur in the future.

Mr. BATSANOV: (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): First of all, Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you on taking up the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament and wish you every success. In fact, I think you have already proved that you can achieve progress on highly complex issues, and find solutions to extremely delicate situations. At the same time the Soviet delegation would like to reiterate its gratitude to your precedessor, Ambassador Benhima of Morocco, for the major contribution he made to the work of the Conference. As this is the first time I have taken the floor in the month of February, I should also like to welcome our new colleagues Ambassador Andrea Negrotto Cambiaso of Italy, Ambassador Hou Zhitong of China, Ambassador Mitsuro Donowaki of Japan, Ambassador Roberto Garcia Moritán of Argentina, Ambassador José Pérez Novoa of Cuba, Ambassador Stephen Ledogar of the United States, Ambassador Gerald Shannon of Canada, Ambassador Horacio Arteaga of Venezuela and Ambassador Miguel Marín Bosch of Mexico. In the time that has elapsed we have seen the departures of Ambassador Vajnar, Ambassador Taylhardat, Ambassador Marchand, Ambassador Friedersdorf and Ambassador García Robles, who for a long time was our inspiration and our oldest member. We wish them prosperity, good health and success.

We should like to associate ourselves with delegates who spoke before me in expressing grief at the very tragic and dreadful death of Ms. Rebuzzi.

Although the session has just begun, we have already succeeded under your presidency, Sir, in solving a very important issue - the question of participation in the work of the Conference by non-member States. In the view of the Soviet delegation, your efforts and your contribution to the constructive solution of this issue deserve the highest appreciation. At the same time I should like to note that it proved possible to reach a positive solution to the issue of observers, as it is conventionally known, as a result of the flexibility and responsible approach displayed by a large number of members of the Conference. The Soviet delegation attaches due importance to this fact. I think that by adopting a positive decision on the requests submitted by non-member States of the Conference we are not simply helping to foster a favourable climate for the work of the Conference and the working bodies concerned - we are actually doing ourselves a service, because these are negotiations on disarmament, i.e. on the reduction and elimination of armaments which threaten all of us. To a considerable extent this relates to the problem of chemical weapons.

It is no accident that the Paris Conference stressed that all States wishing to contribute to the negotiations should be able to do so. The Soviet delegation has unswervingly supported and continues to support this appeal made by the Paris Conference, which is of fundamental significance in guaranteeing the universality of the future convention, and, to put it bluntly without beating about the bush, in order that none of us should ever become the victim of a chemical attack, that there should be no repetition of the

(Mr. Batsanov, USSR)

tragedies which have occurred in recent years. Hence the guaranteeing of the universal nature of the future convention is a goal in which all the members of the Conference on Disarmament, as well as all other States, should have a keen interest. This idea was also reflected in the recent Soviet-American statement on chemical weapons, adopted following talks in Moscow between the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Eduard Shevardnadze, and Secretary of State Baker of the United States. This statement has just been referred to by the distinguished Ambassador Ledogar of the United States, with whom (I hope he will forgive me) we expended a good deal of effort and nervous energy in Moscow to arrive in the end at what we consider a good statement.

Ambassador Ledogar has already described its content. Consequently, without repeating what has already been said I should like to note a few important points in this connection. The statement reaffirms the aim of finalizing the convention at the earliest date. The statement also stresses the desire of both parties, even as the multilateral negotiations proceed, to draw up a bilateral agreement on reciprocal obligations, including, inter alia, the destruction of a considerable part of the two countries' chemical weapons stockpiles. In this connection I should like to stress that in the view of the Soviet Union, such an agreement should contain provision for both the elimination and reduction of chemical weapons stockpiles (this is certainly correct) and the cessation of the production of chemical weapons. In the statement adopted as a result of the recent meeting of ministers stress is laid on the readiness of both sides to reduce their stockpiles of chemical weapons down to very low levels in the first eight years after the convention enters into force. Of course, all remaining stocks of chemical weapons will have to be eliminated, as the statement says, over the subsequent two years. Our position in this regard is unequivocal. We are in favour of the reaffirmation of the already agreed 10-year period for the elimination of all stockpiles of chemical weapons. Of course we agree that all States which are capable of possessing chemical weapons should accede to the convention.

Moreover, we consider that work to this end should begin now, without any delays. At the same time we are far from convinced that the completion of the process of elimination of chemical weapons in the course of the already established 10-year destruction period should be made dependent on accession to the convention by one particular State or another. We are experiencing serious concern in connection with the implications of such an approach, although, as I have already said, we subscribe to the aim of securing participation in the convention by all relevant countries. In the statement it is asserted - and we also deem this to be important - that a multilateral convention should contain a provision whereby all production of chemical weapons must cease from the moment of its entry into force.

In conclusion I should like to say the following. We sincerely welcome all those who, in keeping with the decision just adopted in the Conference, will join us in our work. We can see a continuation and a strengthening of the tendency towards an increase in the number of countries which manifest not theoretical but practical interest in our work. This applies not only to negotiations on chemical weapons, but also to a number of other bodies which either operate within the framework of the Conference on a permanent basis, or else are set up on an annual basis. In supporting the decision just adopted,

(Mr. Batsanov, USSR)

our fundamental premise is that all the countries involved will be participating in our work in the most constructive fashion, remembering that our common purpose is to move forward along the path of arms limitation and disarmament, and that this can be achieved only if you respect your negotiating partner and if you set yourself the goal of progress at disarmament negotiations. It is quite obvious that a different approach - the introduction of elements of confrontation - cannot either lead to success or earn respect. For my part, I should like to state that we will always be ready to lend the necessary support and co-operation to non-member States of the Conference which are going to participate in our joint work.

Mr. REESE (Australia): I take the floor today to speak about the participation this year of 30 non-member States in the Conference on Disarmament. I would hope to have a subsequent opportunity in the course of the Conference to speak about the broader interests Australia has in the area of arms control and disarmament.

Australia welcomes the interest shown by the 30 non-member States in applying to participate in the work of the Conference and in the work of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons in particular. Australia supports the principle of the universality of participation in the work of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, which was endorsed at the Paris Conference. We see that participation as contributing to universal adherence to the Convention. The constructive participation of non-members in the negotiations is, therefore, important. We welcome the substantive contribution which a number of non-members have already made to the Committee's work, and we look forward to that contribution continuing.

In the critical year ahead of us in the Committee we would hope that all participating non-members ensure that their contributions are of a positive character and will help us in our negotiations to conclude the chemical weapons convention.

Mr. von STULPNAGEL (Federal Republic of Germany): As I am taking the floor for the first time under your stewardship, Sir, I first wish to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency for the month of February. I am very happy from a professional and personal point of view to see you in the Chair presiding over our Conference. I also wish to express my gratitude to our previous President, Ambassador Benhima of Morocco. Let me also extend a warm welcome to those representatives which have arrived in the last month: Ambassador García Moritán of Argentina, Ambassador Negrotto Cambiaso of Italy, Ambassador Donowaki of Japan, yourself - Ambassador Wagenmakers of the Netherlands, Amnbassador Pérez Novoa of Cuba, Ambassador Hou of China, Ambassador Arteaga of Venezuela, Ambassador Ledogar of the United States of America, Ambassador Shannon of Canada and Ambassador Bosch of Mexico. We pledge our co-operation to all of the new colleagues.

It is with regret that I note the departure of Ambassador Bullut of Kenya, Ambassador Yamada of Japan, Ambassador van Schaik of the Netherlands, Ambassador Lechuga Hevia of Cuba, Ambassador Fan of China,

(Mr. von Stulpnagel, Federal Republic of Germany)

Ambassador Taylhardat of Venezuela, Ambassador Friedersdorf of the United States of America, Ambassador de Montigny Marchand of Canada and Ambassador García Robles of Mexico, our dean for many, many years.

I would, at this juncture, where we have overcome potentially substantial problems for our negotiations, thank all those participating States and all those member States who have contributed in a responsible and positive way. I would also thank those who have particularly contributed to our negotiations, especially in chemical weapons, over time. I cited as a particular token of fidelity and engagement the delegation of Finland, which has contributed as much, if not more, than member delegations. I may utter the wish that all delegations having the right to participate, members and non-members, contribute more than their presence. What my delegation would regret would be participation not with a material object in view but the perceived behaviour of other States.

Also, the plenary should abide by rule 30 of our rules of procedure, which clearly says that it is the right of any member State of the Conference to raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference.

The CD, which I knew almost four years ago, had strong elements then of confrontation and verbal battles. In the last years, though, we have become more reasonable and more reasoned. We have concentrated more on our work at hand, we have put more impetus in the matters of multilateral disarmament. I hope that all participating States will accept this new and more fruitful style of our Conference. What my delegation hopes for is mainly useful and future-orientated work in the field of chemical weapons, our main course. All States carrying responsibility here - some more, some less - let us all live up to our respective responsibility.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. NASSERI (Islamic Republic of Iran): This is a brief intervention on the issue that we have just decided upon. Therefore, I will confine myself to congratulating you, Mr. President, on taking up the presidency in the hectic month of February. We have already witnessed your diplomatic skills in resolving otherwise difficult problems, and I do not need to elaborate further on that. I think you are already assured of the full co-operation of my delegation on matters related to the work of the Conference, even difficult matters.

May I also, just briefly, thank my dear colleague, the Ambassador of Morocco, for the able way he conducted the affairs of the Conference in the month of August and during the inter-sessional period, and extend a warm welcome to our new colleagues? There are a number of them; for the purpose of brevity, at this stage, I will avoid naming every single one of them to this Conference.

On the issue just decided, I wish to make the following statement, and in doing so, I hope that I can be pardoned for being a bit frank as the

(Mr. Nasseri, Islamic Republic of Iran)

sensitivity of the issue obliges me to be frank and straightforward. This important session of the Conference has commenced its work amidst great enthusiasm as we all anticipate great progress in various areas of disarmament, including above all in the negotiations on the chemical weapons convention. Many have contributed in the past to the gradual but solid development and evolvement of this very comprehensive convention. The tireless efforts of Ambassador Morel were particularly timely as they fully prepared the ground for this year's important deliberations under the able chairmanship of Ambassador Hyltenius and his knowledgeable colleagues.

There is, indeed, good reason for enthusiasm as developments are all encouraging. Collectively they have given rise to the valid perception that the convention is no longer a distant hope but something that is very much for real and very close at hand. It is also understandable that more countries should now wish to participate in the work of the Conference, which would indeed welcome this as another sign that the Conference is moving in the right direction and is able to produce results and achievements. Indeed, the Conference has benefited from the valuable contributions of a number of non-members who have participated in the past as active observers and who are invited with pleasure and gratitutde to continue their participation.

However, considering the very delicate nature of the work of the Conference on Disarmament, particularly on the CW convention, we feel that we should not have become overly anxious. We still believe that we probably have. While we understand the political reasoning behind the new proposal on participation, we are very much concerned about its possible negative implications. This clustered "all or none" proposal may have seemed an easy way out of a possible political confrontation, something that we did not wish to see repeated in this forum again, but whether it can help the work of the Conference and the chemical weapons convention in the future remains doubtful. We believe it was perhaps inappropriate and much less fair to, in a way, put participants with distinguished records of positive contributions on the same footing as countries with the most verified record of use of chemical weapons, but, aside from the question of fairness, we have to be cognizant of the implications for our work. A case-by-case approach was a well-established procedure which gave the members a chance to review and decide on every application based on its merits. Active and positive participation was thus recognized, valued and welcomed. This, in turn, encouraged other countries to participate with the same positive notions and commitment. The new proposal may very well put an end to that useful trend and may even reverse it. We hope this will not be the case, as there have already been a number of statements which stressed the need for participation by non-members with a positive attitude in mind.

I am not suggesting that a full commitment to the CW convention before its finalization should be a pre-condition or prerequisite for participation. There may be States which are still examining the issue. This is their prerogative. But how about those who are fully committed in their official positions and in their practice not to the objective of the convention but quite the contrary? Our reservations on the application by Israel stem from a position of principle shared by many States in and outside our region.

(Mr. Nasseri, Islamic Republic of Iran)

On the application of Iraq there were many reasons for objections. This is a State which still prides itself in official positions on having extensively used chemical weapons as a justified means of warfare, and is engaged in an aggressive chemical weapon production, development and stockpiling programme. Not a single sign thus far that they intend to reverse their decisions and policies regarding this matter - not a single sign.

We have been told that these States should be allowed in, so as to remove any possible excuse for a possible eventual refusal to join the convention. But is there any assurance in this? If we base our work on removing excuses for those who are only looking for excuses, we have probably entrapped ourselves in a never-ending process. Nonetheless, we have decided not to oppose their application for this year, after having received assurances from members and non-members alike that this is not an isolated move but a part of a collection of activities to ensure the universality of the convention and to help eradicate chemical weapons from the world and from our region. The sincere desire of many States which have approached us in the last weeks, along with the dedicated efforts of Ambassador Wagenmakers, have thus contributed to our decision.

I shall add as a personal note that this decision is also a gesture of goodwill to Iraq, which, through reciprocation, may lead to co-operation in other international issues, activities and organizations as well as contributing to peace and security in our region.

I can only reiterate at the end, as the President underlined, that this decision is limited to the current year. The matter stands to be reviewed and reassessed next year within the guidelines that the President set forward.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Ambassador Nasseri, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, for his statement and for the kind words that he addressed to the Chair. Does any other member wish to take the floor? It seems not. I therefore now intend to adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 15 February, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.